



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR        | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/023,583   | 12/14/2001  | Steve Grove                 | 2043.052US1         | 1938             |
| 49845 7590 02/03/2011<br>SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/EBAY<br>P.O. BOX 2938<br>MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402 |             |                             |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER<br>CHENCINSKI, SIEGFRIED E  |             |                             |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT<br>3695   |             | PAPER NUMBER                |                     |                  |
| NOTIFICATION DATE<br>02/03/2011  |             | DELIVERY MODE<br>ELECTRONIC |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@SLWIP.COM  
request@slwip.com

# Office Action Summary

## Application No.

10/023,583

## Applicant(s)

GROVE ET AL.

## Examiner

SIEGFRIED E. CHENCINSKI

## Art Unit

3695

**Period for Reply**  
-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 36-42, 45-49 and 51-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36-42, 45-49 and 51-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/10/10
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Status*

1. Claims 36-42, 45-49 and 51-56 are now pending.

Claims 46 and 55 are amended in the preambles.

The rejection of claims 46-49 and 51-54 under 35 USC 112-2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph are withdrawn based on the amendment of method claim 46's preamble.

Applicant is invited to call the examiner for an interview after final rejection should Applicant be so interested.

The Spiegel reference's patent number has had the last digit corrected from a "9" to an "8", thus listing Spiegel's US patent number as 6,466,918 B1. The examiner regrets any inconvenience this typographical error may have caused applicant.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. **Claims 35-42, 45-49 and 51-56 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Esposito et al. (US Patent 6,587,838 B1, hereafter Esposito) in view of Kopelman et al. (US Patent 7,373,317 B1, hereafter Kopelman), Offutt Jr. et al. (US

Art Unit: 3695

PreGrant Publication 2002/0184059 A1, hereafter Offutt), Spiegel et al. (US Patent 6,466,918 B1, hereafter Spiegel) and Van Horn et al. (US Patent 6,934,690 B1, hereafter Van Horn).

**Re. Claims 36, 46 and 55**, Esposito discloses a method, system and medium, the method, as exemplary, comprising:

- storing in a database maintained by the network-based transaction facility a listing of a plurality of items being offered for sale by a seller in a virtual store of the seller: (Abstract, ll. 10-12; virtual stores are implicit in electronic representations but not explicitly cited as such by Esposito), wherein the items offered for sale are associated with a plurality of transaction types a fixed price-setting process (Col. 5, l. 62);
- accepting at the network-based transaction facility a first request from a client machine accessing the transaction facility over a network, the first request to retrieve a specific item offered for sale by the seller and that meets search criteria provided with the request (Abstract, ll. 14-16; Fig. 4 – 410. It would have been obvious to the practitioner that this would fit a first or an n'th request, and that one or more criteria could be specified.);
- searching the database to determine if any items being offered for sale by the seller meet the search criteria (abstract, ll. 10-12; Col. 2, ll. 13-16), generating a commingled list of located items offered for sale by the seller that meet the search criteria (col. 2, ll. 13-16. Commingling in the list is implicit as long as there are a plurality of items); and
- communicating across the network to the client machine the generated commingled list for display at the client machine (Fig. 4 – 412; Col. 2, ll. 13-20.

The client machine and the network are implicit in Esposito).

The following limitations are not given patentable weight because repetition of a method step is not considered to have patentable novelty (*In re Harza*):

“accepting at the network-based transaction facility a second request from the client machine, the second request to sort the commingled list by specific criteria, wherein the specific criteria includes a specified transaction type of the plurality of transaction types;

Art Unit: 3695

using the sales type field from the items table, looking up in the items table the specified transaction type to determine if any of the items from the commingled list meet the requirements

for the specified transaction type by comparing the specified transaction type to the sales type field in the items table;

generating a sorted list, the sorted list sorted to include only items offered for sale by the seller that meet the specified transaction type included in the second request; and

communicating across the network to the client machine the sorted list for display at the client machine.”.

Esposito does not explicitly disclose an auction price-setting process.

However, Esposito discloses two articles regarding auctions, entitled “GM Buying into Online Auctions” and “Honda to Start Internet Used Car Auctions” (OTHER PUBLICATIONS, p. 2, col. 2, ll. 34-35, 41-42). Further, Kopelman discloses an auction price-setting process (Col. 1, ll. 50-51). The servers in the computers systems and the storage media are implicit in Esposito.

Also, Offutt discloses virtual stores (p. 1, [0008], l. 6).

Esposito does not explicitly disclose “wherein the database includes a database engine server coupled to at least one engine server database including an items table, the items table defining a plurality of fields for each of the plurality of item being offered for sale, including a sale type field for each given item being offered for sale, wherein the sale type field records the price setting process for each of the plurality of items being offered for sale”. However, Spiegel discloses item tables in a database related to a network based transaction facility ().Col. 3, l. 48). Van Horn discloses a sale field in a database related to internet based buying (Col. 11, l. 23). The ordinary practitioner would have seen it as obvious from his own knowledge and these disclosures to establish a “database which includes a database engine server coupled to at least one engine server database including an items table, the items table defining a plurality of fields for each of the plurality of item being offered for sale, including a sale type field for each given item being offered for sale, wherein the sale type field records the price setting process for each of the plurality of items being offered for sale”.

Therefore, an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of Applicant's invention would have seen it as obvious to have combined the art of Esposito, Kopelman, Offut, Spiegel, Van Horn and his own knowledge for the purpose of establishing a method, system and medium for facilitating a transaction by a network-based transaction facility, motivated by a desire to provide a method for facilitating pricing and sales of goods (Kopelman, Col. 2, ll. 46-48).

**Re. Claim 47**, Esposito discloses wherein accepting a search request from a buyer to view certain items according to certain criteria, generating list of items from the commingled list, and displaying the list of items to the buyer's client machine (see the rejection of claim 46). Esposito also discloses the displaying of search results to a buyer (Fig's 5-7). Esposito does not explicitly disclose auction items being offered. However, Kopelman discloses auction items. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the disclosures of Esposito, Kopelman, Offut, Spiegel, Van Horn and his own knowledge for the purpose of responding to a search request limited to auction items and displaying those items to the buyer, motivated by a desire to provide a method for facilitating pricing and sales of goods (Kopelman, Col. 2, ll. 46-48).

**Re. Claim 49**, Esposito discloses accepting a search request from the buyer to view only those items from the commingled list that include a fixed price purchase option; generate a fixed price list of items from the commingled list, the fixed price list including items that have a fixed price purchase option; and display the fixed price list of items to the buyer (Fixed price – Col. 5, l. 62. See the rejection of claim 46 for the balance of these limitations.).

**Re. Claim 51**, Esposito discloses the selection of merchants (equivalent to stores) for buyer selection which are stored in the database (Fig. 4-420, a plurality of merchants), using an interface storing in the database a stores portion including a listing of stores available for buyer selection; providing an interface at the client machine which allow the buyer to indicate a selection from the listing of stores (Fig. 4, 422); and receiving from the buyer's client machine a selection including an indication of a selection from the listing of stores (Fig. 4, 424).

**Re. Claims 37-45**, Esposito suggests, implies and makes obvious the following limitations for implementing method claims 46-54 because Esposito discloses network connected computer systems for implementing a network based transaction facility (Abstract; Fig's 1-7; Col. 2, l. 60 – Col. 7, l. 36):

**Re. Claim 37**, a page server operable to deliver web pages;  
a picture server operable to dynamically deliver images to be displayed within web pages;  
a listing server operable to facilitate category-based browsing of one or more items being offered for sale on the network-based transaction facility; and  
a search server operable to receive search requests and facilitate keyword-based browsing of the one or more items being offered for sale on the network-based transaction facility.

**Re. Claim 38**, wherein the at least one back-end server includes a search index server coupled to a search index server database.

**Re. Claim 39**, wherein the at least one back-end server includes a credit card database server coupled to a credit card server database.

**Re. Claim 40**, wherein the database the user table includes a respective record for each of a plurality of users of the network-based transaction facility.

**Re. Claim 41**, wherein each of the plurality of users is a seller, a buyer, or both a seller and a buyer within the network-based transaction facility.

**Re. Claim 42**, wherein each link between the items and the user table indicates whether a user listed in the user table is a seller or a buyer with respect to one or more items for which records are included within the items table.

**Re. Claim 45**, wherein the plurality of front-end servers act in combination as a display engine to facilitate the display of the at least one client machine of the commingled list of items generated by the network-based transaction facility.

The ordinary practitioner of the art would have seen these system features as obvious for implementing method claims 46-54 because the practitioner would have been familiar with the capabilities of such computer systems such as servers, web pages, browsing, search indexes, networks, databases, user tables, transaction facilities,

number fields and display engines. Therefore, an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of Applicant's invention would have seen it as obvious to have combined the art of Esposito, Kopelman, Offut, Spiegel, Van Horn and his own knowledge for the purpose of establishing a method, system and medium for facilitating a transaction by a network-based transaction facility, motivated by a desire to provide a method for facilitating pricing and sales of goods (Kopelman, Col. 2, ll. 46-48).

**Re. claims 52-54 & 56**, the disclosures of Esposito are cited in the rejections of claims 46-51 above. Neither Esposito nor Kopelman explicitly disclose virtual stores. However, Offutt discloses virtual stores for online shoppers (p. 1, [0008], l. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the disclosures of Esposito, Kopelman, Offut, Spiegel, Van Horn and his own knowledge in order to formulate the following features:

**Re. Claim 52**, a selection from a listing of stores provided according to a category; and providing an interface displaying a list of seller's virtual stores based on the selected category.

**Re. Claim 53**, receiving from the buyer's client machine a selection indicating a chosen one of seller's virtual stores from the listing of stores.

**Re. Claim 54**, indicating the chosen one of the seller's virtual stores, performing a look-up operation on an items table within the database to obtain a title and details including a transaction type associated with each of one or more items available in the chosen one of the seller's virtual stores.

**Re. Claim 56**, wherein the database includes items offered for sale in at least one seller's virtual store that offers for sale both at least one item for sale using an auction-type price setting process and at least one item offered for sale using a fixed price setting process.

The practitioner's motivation would have been a desire to provide a method for facilitating pricing and sales of goods (Kopelman, Col. 2, ll. 46-48).



**3. Claim 48 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Esposito in view of Kopelman, Offut, Spiegel and Van Horn as applied to claim 46 above, and further in view of O'Neill et al. (US Patent 5,987,440, hereafter O'Neil).

**Re. Claim 48**, neither Esposito, Kopelman, Offut, Spiegel or Van Horn explicitly disclose transaction types which include items for sale using a hybrid auction/fixed price-setting. However, O'Neil discloses a hybrid auction/fixed price-setting (Col. 34, ll. 26-33, Col. 67, ll. 64-65). Therefore, an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of Applicant's invention would have seen it as obvious to have combined the art of Esposito, Kopelman, Offut, Spiegel, Van Horn, O'Neil and his own knowledge for the purpose of establishing a method, system and medium for facilitating a transaction by a network-based transaction facility including a hybrid auction/fixed price-setting, motivated by a desire to provide a method for facilitating pricing and sales of goods (Kopelman, Col. 2, ll. 46-48).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

**4.** Applicant's arguments filed November 23, 2010 regarding claims 36-42, 45-49 and 51-56 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

**REMARKS Re. Spiegel et al.- Typographical Error** - Assuming that the Examiner used Walker et al. as the actual prior art. Since the examiner referred to Spiegel et al. by name (referring to US Patent 6,466,918 B1) several times in the last office action mailed July 8, 2010. It is not reasonable with such repetition of Spiegel that the examiner could have somehow meant Walker et al. (US Patent 6,466,919 B1). An inventor search would have identified the slight typographical error of one digit. More importantly, Applicant should have contacted the examiner by telephone to obtain clarification of an obvious typographical error as is normally done by other Applicants, often through a telephone call by someone in Applicant's attorney's office. The same is normally done when an Applicant desires an interview, which Applicant has also chosen not to do. Therefore, the assumption that the examiner cited Walker et al. (US Patent 6,466,919 B1) is not appropriate and not accepted. Accordingly, the examiner does not

Art Unit: 3695

accept Applicant's arguments based on Applicant's assumption that Walker has been cited as prior art in the office action mailed July 8, 2010.

**ARGUMENT A:** (Argument re. claim 35 (p. 11, l. 20). This is erroneous, but apparently a typographical error, since claim 35 has been canceled. Applicant also makes typographical errors, as we all do from time to time).

Applicant argues that the limitation regarding the second request should be given patentable weight (p. 11, l. 11 – p. 15, l. 4).

**RESPONSE:**

The limitation involving the second request does not appear to have any connection to the first request but is merely a duplication of the limitation involving the first request.

Accordingly, it is a repetition which properly invokes *In re Harza* as not having patentable weight as a repetition.

**ARGUMENT B:** Argument treating the rejection of 36 as involving a Walker reference instead of Spiegel (p. 15, l. 30 – p. 18, l. 2).

**RESPONSE:**

This line of argument is moot for the reasons stated above that Walker is not on the record as prior art in the rejections of any claims in this application. Applicant is referred to the above rejection of claims 36, 46 and 55.

**ARGUMENT C:** Traversal of the rejection of claim 46 on the same basis as the traversal of claim 36 on which 46 depends (p. 18, ll. 3-19).

**RESPONSE:**

Claim 36 stands rejected for the reasons stated above.

***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Siegfried Chencinski whose telephone number is (571)272-6792. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 9am to 6pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Charles Kyle, can be reached on (571) 272-6746.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington D.C. 20231***

or Faxed to (571)273-8300 [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

or Faxed to (571) 273-6792 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the address found on the above USPTO web site in Alexandria, VA.

Application/Control Number: 10/023,583

Page 11

Art Unit: 3695

SEC

Art Unit 3695

January 29, 2011

/Charles R. Kyle/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3695